

## **AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet, which includes Fig. 2-3, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2-3. In Figure 2, previously omitted element C has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet  
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

## **REMARKS**

Original claims 1 through 9 are pending in the instant application. Pursuant to the Office Action of April 21, 2005, claims 1 through 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Weber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,330,249).

Applicant has amended the specification to better conform to the drawings. No new matter has been added. In addition Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 6, 7 and 9, cancelled claim 2, and added new claims 10 and 11. Applicant has also corrected Figure 2 to better conform the drawings to the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to the examiner's statement the combination of elements and limitations of Applicant's bicycle seat as claimed by Applicant are in no way suggested or disclosed in the Weber et al. reference (U.S. Patent 5,330,249). It is absolutely and unequivocally clear that the Weber et al. reference does not disclose a substantially rigid posterior section of a bicycle seat. Weber et al. describes a cushioned bicycle seat and claims a "bicycle saddle comprising...a cushion for dampening vibration..., the cushion disposed on the top surface of the saddle base..." Applicant's saddle, in comparison as to its posterior section, is comprised of a substantially wide, substantially flat and substantially rigid posterior section. Weber et al. discloses a cushion for a bicycle seat – for the nose section and for the posterior section. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as being improper and as the rejection is unsupported by the art it should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Weber et al. does not describe or claim that the transition from the posterior section to a nose section of relatively narrow width is within an angle of 90 to 125 degrees as does Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 10. Applicant describes the transition in the amended specification from the posterior section to the nose section as follows: "The flat posterior of seat 20 will transition along a radius R less than 5 inches to nose section NS of seat 20 within transition section TS and within an angle A of between 90 and 125 degrees between the leading front edge of the posterior section LFE and the central axis of the nose section CA (Figure 2). This abrupt transition functions to remove pressure from the medial border of the pubic rami during anteriorly rotated pelvic positions." In addition, Weber et al. does not teach or claim any angle in

the transition from the posterior section to the nose section as stated by Examiner. Applicant describes the transition from the posterior section to the nose section by an “angle between the central axis of said nose section and the vertical plane containing the leading front edge of said first support surface is within a range of 90-125°.” Examiner points to columns 5-8 of Weber et al. in support of Examiner’s argument that the Weber et al. reference discloses such an angular relationship between the posterior and nose sections, but Applicant respectfully points out and submits that the only degree delineation set out in columns 5-8 of Weber et al. deals with temperature and not with any angular relationship between the nose section and the posterior base with a relatively wide support surface. In fact, Weber et al. is silent as to any angular relationship. Moreover, the only description of the saddle claimed in Weber et al. comprises a “saddle base having a top surface defining a horn area and a rear area...” (Note: the horn area described by Weber et al. is assumably the nose section.) That is the extent of the description by Weber et al. on any relationship between the horn/nose section and the rear area. Weber et al. never mentions any specific shape or makes any claims with regard to such an angular relationship between the horn/nose section and the rear area. The figures in Weber et al., in particular Figures 7, 8 and 9, all illustrate a saddle where the horn/nose section is wide and the relationship between the rear and the nose section is defined by an angle well in excess of 125 degrees and more likely closer to 180 degrees (see Figures 7, 8 and 9).

The invention in Weber et al. consists of a cushion for absorbing shock, damping vibration and distributing pressure. The cushion is composed of a bladder. “The cushion 20 may be attached to the top surface 83 by a suitable composition 87 for adhering the bladder to the base, such as, for example, polyurethane foam. The cushion 20 includes a deformable bladder 22 of 5 to 10 mil thick, polyester based polyurethane film, which defines a chamber 24 for containing a fluid 26, which in this embodiment is air.” (Column 7, lines 56-62)

The Weber et al. reference clearly and conclusively does not show or suggest any of the following features as described and claimed by this Applicant: (i) a bicycle seat having a relatively wide posterior seat section; (ii) a relatively narrow nose section; (iii) a transition section which abruptly joins the posterior seat section with the nose section

such that the angle is between 90 and 125 degrees; and (iv) a nose section construction in which a portion of the nose section is hollow and permits a portion of the support surface of the nose section to deform proportionate to the load placed thereon by the rider.

### **SUMMARY**

In summary, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 6 and 9 must be removed as the reference cited by the Examiner does not contain every element recited in the amended claims.

The above arguments, while directed towards amended independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 10, are intended to apply to dependent claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 as well.

Dependent claims 3, 4, and 5 depend upon independent claim 1, dependent claims 7 and 8 depend on independent claim 6, and new dependent claim 11 depends on new independent claim 10, and all dependent claims are thus patentable for the same reasons given above with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 10, and more so since they add additional limitations.

### **CONCLUSION**

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference with applicant's attorney would expedite or conclude prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact applicant's attorney by telephone at the below-listed number.

In summary, applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1 and 3 through 11, as amended, are clearly allowable for the reasons stated herein and therefore request such allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Prokopetz  
Registration No. 52,134  
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 029889  
919/683-5514  
Dated: July 6, 2005

